



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,136	10/31/2003	Tadashi Shiraishi	F-8019	3465

28107 7590 07/20/2006
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP
122 EAST 42ND STREET
SUITE 4000
NEW YORK, NY 10168

EXAMINER

CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,136

Applicant(s)

SHIRAISHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Sharidan Carrillo

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-17 is/are pending in the application. *bsc 7/17/06*
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-17 is/are rejected. *bsc 7/17/06*
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The amendment filed 4/19/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The limitation of 15 mm, as amended in the specification on paragraph 18 of page 9 is not supported by the specification as originally filed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification provides no support for labeling the outlet header as the inlet

Art Unit: 1746

header and the inlet header as the outlet header, as recited in newly presented claims 14-16. The limitation of a non-corrugated pipe is not supported by the specification as originally filed.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 14-16 are indefinite for the following reasons. It is unclear how the skilled artisan can label and "outlet" as an "inlet" and an "inlet" header as an "outlet" header since the terms "outlet" and "inlet" have totally opposite meanings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry (42724007) in view of Sameshima (JP01-028625) and further in view of Withers Jr (4007774).

Barry teaches a method of cleaning pipes and tubes, in heat exchangers, using ice in combination with water (Abstract, col. 2, lines 60-65, col. 4, lines 25-45). Barry fails to teach the limitations of connecting the suction hose to the pipe and suction pump, connecting the ice-feeding hose to the pipe and supplying ice and water from the hopper into the pipe.

Sameshima teaches flushing a pipe using a carriage 1 with a suction pipe mounted thereon and waste water collecting tank 2 (Fig. 1, page 3). On page 5, Sameshima teaches cleaning with ice water until clean water flushes into the waste water collecting tank. Ice water enters port 12 and is suction pumped through the

branch pipe and waste is collected in tank 2. On page 6, Sameshima teaches using the method for cleaning of a piping. Sameshima fails to teach cleaning heat exchangers.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Barry to include using a suction hose and pump in connection with the pipe, in order to flush ice and water through the pipe, as taught by Sameshima, thereby cleaning the interior surface of the pipe of debris. In reference to the hopper, Barry et al. teach various magazines such as hoppers (Fig. 11), for storing ice particles and further transporting the pipe in the piping for cleaning. Additionally, it is conventional in the art to use hoppers for the generation and storage of ice particles (US5934566).

Barry in view of Sameshima fail to teach the limitations directed to the principle of reverse-flow. Withers Jr. teaches cleaning heat exchanger tubes by periodically reversing the fluid flow in order to remove coating deposits. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Barry to include reverse flow, as taught by Withers, for purposes of effectively removing contaminants from the interior surface of the heat exchanger tubes. Additionally, the concept of enhanced cleaning by reverse flow is notoriously well known and conventionally practiced in the art (Thomas, 4,054,150; Edstrand et al. 5,680,877).

Barry in view of Sameshima and Withers Jr fail to teach a transparent portion of the ice feeding hose, as recited in claim 7. However, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to modify the method of Barry et al. to include a transparent hose since Barry teaches the need to detect the completion of the cleaning cycle by

observing whether ice flows into the waste water collecting tank at a faster velocity. In reference to claim 9, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to adjust the ratio of ice to water in order to form an effective composition which would be easily flowable, yet effective for scrubbing the interior surface of the pipe. In reference to claim 11, Barry et al., (col. 3, lines 35-40) teaches that the diameter of the pig is selected to permit it to penetrate the lumen of the contaminated tube. Given the teachings of Barry et al, it would have been well within the level of the skilled artisan to modify the size of the ice cube depending upon the diameter of the heat exchange tubing being cleaned and the amount of contaminants present therein.

10. Claims 6, 8, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry (42724007) in view of Sameshima (JP01-028625) and further in view of Withers Jr (4007774) and further in view of Leon et al. (4327560).

Barry teaches a method of cleaning pipes and tubes, in heat exchangers, using ice in combination with water (Abstract, col. 2, lines 60-65, col. 4, lines 25-45). Barry fails to teach the limitations of connecting the suction hose to the pipe and suction pump, connecting the ice-feeding hose to the pipe and supplying ice and water from the hopper into the pipe.

Sameshima teaches flushing a pipe using a carriage 1 with a suction pipe mounted thereon and waste water collecting tank 2 (Fig. 1, page 3). On page 5, Sameshima teaches cleaning with ice water until clean water flushes into the waste water collecting tank. Ice water enters port 12 and is suction pumped through the

branch pipe and waste is collected in tank 2. On page 6, Sameshima teaches using the method for cleaning of a piping. Sameshima fails to teach cleaning heat exchangers.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Barry to include using a suction hose and pump in connection with the pipe, in order to flush ice and water through the pipe, as taught by Sameshima, thereby cleaning the interior surface of the pipe of debris. In reference to the hopper, Barry et al. teach various magazines such as hoppers (Fig. 11), for storing ice particles and further transporting the pipe in the piping for cleaning. Additionally, it is conventional in the art to use hoppers for the generation and storage of ice particles (US5934566).

Barry in view of Sameshima fail to teach the limitations directed to the principle of reverse-flow. Withers Jr. teaches cleaning heat exchanger tubes by periodically reversing the fluid flow in order to remove coating deposits. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Barry to include reverse flow, as taught by Withers, for purposes of effectively removing contaminants from the interior surface of the heat exchanger tubes. Additionally, the concept of enhanced cleaning by reverse flow is notoriously well known and conventionally practiced in the art (Thomas, 4,054,150; Edstrand et al. 5,680,877).

Barry in view of Sameshima and Withers fail to teach a copper coil pipe. Leon teaches that it is well known in the art that heat exchangers are conventionally made of copper coils (col. 1, lines 43-45). Therefore, it would have been within the level of the

Art Unit: 1746

skilled artisan to clean copper coil piping since Barry teaches heat exchangers and heat exchangers are typically made of copper coil piping.

Barry in view of Sameshima and Withers Jr fail to teach a transparent portion of the ice feeding hose, as recited in claim 8. However, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to modify the method of Barry et al. to include a transparent hose since Barry teaches the need to detect the completion of the cleaning cycle by observing whether ice flows into the waste water collecting tank at a faster velocity. In reference to claim 10, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to adjust the ratio of ice to water in order to form an effective composition which would be easily flowable, yet effective for scrubbing the interior surface of the pipe. In reference to claim 12, Barry et al., (col. 3, lines 35-40) teaches that the diameter of the pig is selected to permit it to penetrate the lumen of the contaminated tube. Given the teachings of Barry et al, it would have been well within the level of the skilled artisan to modify the size of the ice cube depending upon the diameter of the heat exchange tubing being cleaned and the amount of contaminants present therein.

11. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barry (42724007) in view of Sameshima (JP01-028625) and further in view of Williams Jr. (5499639).

Barry teaches a method of cleaning pipes and tubes, in heat exchangers, using ice in combination with water (Abstract, col. 2, lines 60-65, col. 4, lines 25-45). Barry fails to teach the limitations of connecting the suction hose to the pipe and suction

pump, connecting the ice-feeding hose to the pipe and supplying ice and water from the hopper into the pipe.

Sameshima teaches flushing a pipe using a carriage 1 with a suction pipe mounted thereon and waste water collecting tank 2 (Fig. 1, page 3). On page 5, Sameshima teaches cleaning with ice water until clean water flushes into the waste water collecting tank. Ice water enters port 12 and is suction pumped through the branch pipe and waste is collected in tank 2. On page 6, Sameshima teaches using the method for cleaning of a piping. Sameshima fails to teach cleaning heat exchangers.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Barry to include using a suction hose and pump in connection with the pipe, in order to flush ice and water through the pipe, as taught by Sameshima, thereby cleaning the interior surface of the pipe of debris. In reference to the hopper, Barry et al. teach various magazines such as hoppers (Fig. 11), for storing ice particles and further transporting the pipe in the piping for cleaning. Additionally, it is conventional in the art to use hoppers for the generation and storage of ice particles (US5934566).

Barry in view of Sameshima fails to teach the inlet and outlet headers of the heat exchangers, as recited in claim 13. Williams teaches that it is well known and conventional for heat-exchangers to have inlet and outlet headers 24, 32, to provide communication between the plurality of tubes and manifold chamber. Williams further teaches applying a fluid media comprising a cleaning solid to each one of the headers to clean the heat exchanger (col. 3, lines 10-23, lines 55-60). It would have been

obvious to the skilled artisan to have modified the method of Barry to include headers, since Williams teaches that headers are conventionally used in heat exchangers to communicate the tubes to the manifold chamber and further teaches headers which serve as inlet and outlets for delivery of the cleaning media.

In reference to claims 14-16 and in view of the indefiniteness, the limitations are met by Barry. In reference to claim 17, refer to Fig. 1 of Barry which illustrates the coil pipe 11 are non-corrugated.

Response to Arguments

12. The rejection of claim 6, under 112, first paragraph, new matter, is withdrawn in view of arguments and support in the instant specification.

13. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

14. Applicant argues that one skilled in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of success since Barry teaches using propelled pigs instead of suction as a driving means. Applicant argues that Barry cannot be modified to include the use of suction since it would be counterproductive and diametrically opposed to the pressure

Art Unit: 1746

propelled method. The use of suction as a driving means would not be counterproductive since it serves as an alternative means for achieving the same purpose of cleaning the interior of the pipe. Additionally, the skilled artisan would recognize the advantages of using a suction means as compared to a launcher since the former would require less equipment and easier to use.

15. Applicant argues that there is no suggestion as to how the ice pigs could be automatically transferred from a hopper without outside intervention or assistance. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive because they are not commensurate in scope with the instantly claimed invention. Additionally, Barry teaches using a hopper in which pigs may be fed into the launcher. The modification of Barry to include a suction means would result in the pigs being fed from the hopper into the tubing and further suctioned to remove contaminants therefrom. It is well known in the art, as evidenced by Fujii (JP58-3686) to deliver ice cubes directly from a container into the piping and abrasively cleaning the piping by applying a suction means.

16. Applicant further argues that there is no reasonable expectation of success since there is no indication that the same fouling agents present in the sewer and water lines will have the same characteristic as the heat exchangers. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive because they are not commensurate in scope. Additionally, since both references teach cleaning the interior of the piping, one would reasonably expect the abrasive cleaning with ice cubes to remove contaminants present on the interior of the tube.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Boisture teaches a method of cleaning tube bundles. Takanashi et al. teach cleaning the interior of a pipe.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan Carrillo whose telephone number is 571-272-1297. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W 6:30-4:00pm, alternating Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharidan Carrillo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

bsc



SHARIDAN CARRILLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER